



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,745	05/09/2002	Kalle Ahmavaara	915-418	2050
4955	7590	03/08/2005	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	
DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/019,745	Applicant(s) AHMAVAARA, KALLE	
	Examiner Quynh H Nguyen	Art Unit 2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/4/05, 12/28/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2 and 19 recite the limitation "the mobile station" in --the second line of the claims--. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 15, 19-20, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Den Heuvel et al. (U.S. Patent 6,223,030).

As to claims 1 and 28, Van Den Heuvel teaches a method of establishing a connection in a telecommunications system in which an intermediate network (Fig. 1, common communication system 19) provides for communications between a user terminal (Fig. 1, subscriber unit 20) and one or more of a plurality of serving network entities (Fig. 1, communication systems 11-17) each capable of providing communications services to the user terminal (Fig. 1, 19) by means of at least one telecommunication protocol (col. 2, lines 51-53), the method comprising the steps of the

Art Unit: 2642

intermediate network transmitting to the user terminal an indication of the communications services provided by one of the serving network entities (col. 2, lines 54-55) and the user terminal selecting one or more of the communication services (col. 2, lines 59-62).

As to claim 2, Van Den Heuvel teaches to receive a desired set of services the common communication system determines a set of serving network entities indicated together providing the set of services and attempt to establish a connection with the serving network via the intermediate network (col. 2, line 59 through col. 3, line 19).

As to claim 3, Van Den Heuvel teaches the indication is generated by the intermediate network (col. 3, lines 12-15).

As to claim 4, Van Den Heuvel teaches the user terminal is capable of communicating by radio with the intermediate network (Fig. 1, subscriber unit 20 has an antenna to communicate with other system by radio).

As to claims 5 and 8, Van Den Heuvel teaches the intermediate network is operable according to the Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (col. 2, lines 62-65).

As to claim 7, Van Den Heuvel teaches the intermediate network is a radio access network (Fig. 1, common communication system 19).

As to claims 9 and 10, Van Den Heuvel teaches the indication is transmitted to the user terminal during the establishment of a connection between the user terminal and the intermediate network (col. 3, lines 12-15).

As to claim 11, Van Den Heuvel teaches the indication is transmitted to the user terminal after the establishment of a connection between the user terminal and the intermediate network (col. 2, lines 51-55).

As to claim 15, Van Den Heuvel teaches adjusting a number of paging areas according to a number of serving network entities (col. 3, lines 12-19). For example, when the user access GSM system, the user receives an indication of available communication systems within the coverage area such as a half-rate GSM.

As to claims 19 and 20, Van Den Heuvel teaches the intermediate network is capable of routing signals between the user terminal or mobile station (subscriber unit 20 or mobile station) and one of the serving network entities (col. 2, lines 54-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6, 12-14, 16-18, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Heuvel. et al. (U.S. Patent 6,223,030) in view of Korpela (U.S. Patent 6,801,786).

As to claims 6, 17, and 18, Van Den Heuvel does not teach the serving network entities are core networks and is capable of providing for circuit switched or packet

switched communications between the terminal and another telecommunications network.

Korpela teaches a communication system comprising at least one user terminal, an access network, and one or more core networks connected to the access network (col. 3, lines 62-65), circuit switched or packet switched (col. 4, lines 46-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the core networks, circuit switched, and packet switched networks, as taught by Korpela, in Van Den Heuvel's communication system in order to enable the user terminal to communicate with several core network protocols, and offer a flexible possibility of updating the system, because core networks of new type can be add easily in parallel with the existing ones.

As to claims 12-14, Van Den Heuvel teaches the subscriber unit determined which system it desires to utilize and make request to the intermediate network and receive an enabling program for the selected network entity (col. 2, lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious that prior to determining which system the subscriber unit desires to utilize, it is necessary to transmit an indication for reallocation of equipment in consequence of a serving radio network controller relocation, and then change the serving network entity. For example, if the user selects UMTS 14, the user will open channel 22 associated with the selected system.

As to claim 16, Korpela teaches one of the serving network entities is capable of providing for communications between the terminal and another telecommunication network (col. 3, lines 62-65).

As to claim 21, it would have been obvious modify the common communication system 19 in Van Den Heuvel to include a UMTS to enable it to connect with other UMTS or similar system in such a way that at least the radio connection is common in the sense of using the same radio interface.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 22-27 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claims 22 and 29, prior art of record fails to teach, or render obvious, alone or in combination a method of establishing a connection in a telecommunications system in which an intermediate network provides for communications between a user terminal and one or more of a plurality of serving network entities each capable of providing communications services to the user terminal by means of at least one telecommunication protocol, the method comprising establishing for each user terminal for each serving network entity with which that terminal is registered an instance of a management process for informing a respective serving network entity of changes in a connection path to a respective mobile station through the intermediate network, whereby on a change in the connection path to the mobile station / user terminal

Art Unit: 2642

through the intermediate network, each serving network entity is informed of the change by means of the respective instance.

Claims 23-27 are objected because they depend on objected claim 22.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Krebs et al. (U.S. Patent 5,548,631) teach method and apparatus for supporting at least two communication services in a communication system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2642

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
March 3, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bing Q. Bui', written in a cursive style.

BING Q. BUI
PRIMARY EXAMINER